

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please cancel claims 151 and 164 without prejudice, and enter amended claims 149, 162, and 177-178 as follows:

149. (Amended) A color filter (CF) substrate having a color filter and  
2 electrodes and sandwiching a liquid crystal with a counter substrate, comprising:

3 first protrusions for regulating azimuths of orientations of said liquid crystal,  
4 said first protrusions being formed on said electrodes and including dielectric materials; and  
5 second protrusions for defining a gap between said color filter substrate and  
6 said counter substrate.

162. (Amended) A liquid crystal display device comprising:

2 a first substrate and a second substrate; and  
3 a liquid crystal sandwiched between said first substrate and said second  
4 substrate,

5 wherein said first substrate is a color filter (CF) substrate having a color filter, and further

6 wherein said first substrate includes:  
7 first protrusions for regulating azimuths of orientations of said liquid crystal,  
8 said first protrusions being formed on said electrodes and including dielectric materials; and  
9 second protrusions for defining a gap between said first and second substrates.

1                   177. (Amended) A liquid crystal display device according to claim 162,  
2       wherein tops of said second protrusions contact a portion of a surface of said second  
3       substrate.

*C 3*

1                   178. (Amended) A liquid crystal display device according to claim 162,  
2       wherein tops of said second protrusions contact tops of third protrusions arranged on said  
3       second substrate.

#### REMARKS

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a), as not showing all features of the claims. Applicants respectfully traverse. Specifically, Applicants submit that the features of the present invention regarding second protrusions formed by stacking plural kinds of colored filters are shown in FIGS. 181A-188B. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections are respectfully requested.

Claims 149-156 and 159-161 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner finds the term “counter substrate” confusing. Applicants respectfully traverse as follows.

As the Examiner is aware, the term “counter substrate” is not a technical term, defining only one kind of substrate, but a *relative* term, which defines the counter substrate